APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/054,623	01/18/2002	Kelvin Chong	2102299-991110	5779

29906 7590 11/18/2004	EXAMINER
INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ, P.C.	NAHAR, QAMRUN

	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ, P.C. 7150 E. CAMELBACK, STE. 325 SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85251	2124	

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/054,623	CHONG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Qamrun Nahar	2124	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 January 2002</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>18 January 2002</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-26 have been examined.

Oath/Declaration

2.   The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37

CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See

MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

> The oath or declaration is defective because:
>
> It does not state that the person making the oath or declaration believes the named
> inventor or **inventors** to be the original and first inventor or **inventors** of the subject
> matter which is claimed and for which a patent is sought.

That is, the phrase "I believe, I am the original, first and original inventor of the subject matter"
in the declaration should be "I believe, I am the original, first and **joint** inventor of the subject
matter" because there is more than one inventor.

Specification

3.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains reference numbers of a

figure. Please remove the reference numbers. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

4.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on pg. 5, line 11, the

specification refers to a United States patent application. However, the application serial number

is missing. Please amend to include the application serial number.

> Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6.   Claims 1-12 and 19-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Flores

(U.S. 5,630,069).

Per Claim 1:

The Flores patent discloses:

- a system for visually building applications (column 3, lines 17-23)

- a first module adapted to allow a developer to visually design workflow for an application (column 5, lines 35-40 and column 7, lines 10-30)

- a second module adapted to allow a developer to design views for said application (column 5, lines 41-45)

- and a third module adapted to allow a developer to integrate data sources within said application (column 5, lines 9-12).

Per Claim 2:

The Flores patent discloses:

- further comprising an interactive development environment for allowing a developer to interact with said first, second and third modules to design said application (column 14, lines 33-41).

Per Claim 3:

The Flores patent discloses:

- wherein said interactive development environment comprises a graphical user interface for allowing a developer to visually interact with said first, second and third module (column 14, lines 33-41).

Per Claim 4:

The Flores patent discloses:

- wherein said system is adapted to allow a developer to design multi-modal applications (column 3, lines 56-67).

Per Claim 5:

The Flores patent discloses:

- wherein said system is adapted to allow a developer to design multi-channel applications
(column 4, lines 22-27).

Per Claim 6:

The Flores patent discloses:

- wherein said system is adapted to allow a developer to design multi-channel applications
including at least one channel selected from the group comprising voice channels, web
channels, and wireless web channels (column 4, lines 22-27).

Per Claim 7:

The Flores patent discloses:

- a system for visually building multi-channel applications (column 3, lines 17-23)

- an interactive development environment for visually designing workflow for a multi-
channel application, said environment being adapted to allow a developer to independently
design said workflow in a plurality of layers, each of said layers corresponding to at least
one channel of said application (column 3, lines 56-67 and column 14, lines 33-41).

Per Claim 8:

The Flores patent discloses:

- wherein said interactive development environment provides a graphical interface for

independently displaying and designing said plurality of layers (column 14, lines 33-41).

Per Claim 9:

The Flores patent discloses:

- wherein said interface is adapted to independently display a root layer including states

common to each of said channels of said application, and to allow a developer to visually

design said root layer (column 3, lines 56-67).

Per Claim 10:

The Flores patent discloses:

- wherein said graphical interface is further adapted to independently display a voice layer

including states common to a voice channel of said application, and to allow a developer to

visually design said voice layer (column 3, lines 56-67).

Per Claim 11:

The Flores patent discloses:

- **wherein said graphical interface is further adapted to independently display a visual layer including states common to a visual channel of said application, and to allow a developer to visually design said visual layer** (column 3, lines 56-67).

Per Claim 12:

The Flores patent discloses:

- **wherein said graphical interface is further adapted to display combinations of said root, voice and visual layers** (column 3, lines 56-67).

Per Claim 19:

The Flores patent discloses:

- **a method of building an application** (column 3, lines 17-23)

- **providing a visual development environment; designing an application workflow within said visual development environment, said application workflow describing certain business logic and comprising a plurality of states and a plurality of transitions, linking said states; and converting said application workflow into an application descriptor** (column 3, lines 56-67; column 5, lines 35-40; column 7, lines 10-30; and column 14, lines 33-41).

Per Claim 20:

The Flores patent discloses:

- further comprising the step of: designing a presentation of said application within said visual development environment (column 5, lines 41-45).

Per Claim 21:

The Flores patent discloses:

- further comprising the step of: internationalizing said presentation of said application within said visual development environment (column 5, lines 41-45).

Per Claim 22:

The Flores patent discloses:

- further comprising the step of: integrating data sources into said application by use of said visual development environment (column 5, lines 9-12).

Per Claim 23:

The Flores patent discloses:

- **wherein said application workflow describes a multi-channel application** (column 4, lines

22-27).

Per Claim 24:

The Flores patent discloses:

- **wherein said application workflow is designed in a plurality of layers, each layer**

including states and transitions common to at least one channel of said application (column

3, lines 56-67).

Per Claim 25:

The Flores patent discloses:

- **further comprising the step of: componentizing a plurality of said states and transitions**

into a reusable sub-model within said visual development environment (column 4, lines 53-

57).

Per Claim 26:

The Flores patent discloses:

- **further comprising the step of: packaging said application workflow into a reusable**

component within said visual development environment (column 4, lines 53-57).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flores (U.S.

5,630,069) in view of Ambler (U.S. 6,393,456).

Per Claim 13:

        Flores teaches a system for visually building applications (column 3, lines 17-23),

comprising: a graphical user interface adapted to allow a user to visually build a workflow for an

application (column 5, lines 35-40 and column 7, lines 10-30). Flores does not explicitly teach a

module for converting said visually built workflow into a markup language. Ambler teaches a

module for converting said visually built workflow into a markup language (column 8, lines 43-

46).

        It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of

the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Flores to include a module for

converting said visually built workflow into a markup language using the teaching of Ambler.

The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated

to use a standard language that allows greater flexibility.

Per Claim 14:

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated, and Ambler further teaches wherein said

markup language comprises an XML-based language (column 8, lines 43-46).

Per Claim 15:

The rejection of claim 14 is incorporated, and Flores further teaches wherein said

graphical user interface is adapted to allow a user to visually build a single workflow for an

application capable of operating over a plurality of channels (column 3, lines 56-67 and column

14, lines 33-41).

Per Claim 16:

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated, and Flores further teaches wherein said

graphical user interface is adapted to allow a user to visually build a single workflow for an

application capable of operating in a plurality of modes (column 3, lines 56-67).

Per Claim 17:

The rejection of claim 13 is incorporated, and Flores further teaches a second graphical

user interface adapted to allow a developer to build views of an application (column 5, lines 41-

45); and Ambler further teaches a second module adapted to convert said built views into a

markup language (column 12, lines 49-59).

Per Claim 18:

The rejection of claim 17 is incorporated, and Ambler further teaches wherein said

markup language comprises an XML-based language (column 8, lines 43-46).

Conclusion

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to

Qamrun Nahar whose telephone number is (571) 272-3730. The examiner can normally be

reached on Mondays through Thursdays from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM. The examiner can also be

reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kakali Chaki, can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or processing is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

QN
November 15, 2004